

Passive Quantum Erasure for Neutral Kaons¹

A. Bramon¹, G. Garbarino² and B. C. Hiesmayr³

¹*Grup de Física Teòrica, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193 Bellaterra, Spain*

²*Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Torino and INFN, Sezione di Torino
I-10125 Torino, Italy*

³*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Vienna, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

Abstract

Quantum marking and quantum erasure are discussed for the neutral kaon system. Contrary to other two-level systems, strangeness and lifetime of a neutral kaon state can be alternatively measured via an “*active*” or a “*passive*” procedure. This offers new quantum erasure possibilities. In particular, the operation of a quantum eraser in the “*delayed choice*” mode is clearly illustrated.

1 Introduction

Since the foundation of quantum mechanics, physicists know that the heart of Bohr’s complementarity principle lies in the role played by measurement devices. In 1982 Scully and Drühl [1, 2] proposed a gedanken experiment—since then known as the *quantum eraser*—to discuss some of the subtle aspects of quantum measurement which are related to still missing keys to explain the appearance of a classical world in quantum theory. It is similarly well known that all two-level quantum systems are in many aspects fully equivalent and admit a unified treatment in terms of Pauli matrices, *qubit* states and SU(2) formalism. Best known examples of such two-level systems are offered by spin-1/2 states, polarized photon states and neutral kaon

¹Published in *Symmetries in Gravity and Field Theory*, ed. by V. Aldaya and J. M. Cervero, Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, 2004, p. 223. Contribution to the Festschrift in honor of Prof. José Adolfo de Azcárraga for his 60th birthday, Salamanca (Spain), June 9–11, 2003.

states. Experimental tests of quantum erasure have been performed using (mostly, polarized) photon states [3, 4, 5]. The general purpose of the present contribution is to extend these quantum eraser considerations to the neutral kaon system.

The basic idea behind quantum eraser experiments is that two indistinguishable and thus interfering amplitudes of a quantum system, the *object*, can become distinguishable (“marked”) thanks to the *entanglement* with a second quantum system, the *meter*. In two-path interferometric devices, the latter system is frequently called a “which way” detector. If the information stored in the meter system—a kind of quantum *mark*—is even in principle accessible, the object system loses all interference abilities. However, if one somehow manages to “erase” this distinguishability, by correlating the outcomes of the measurements on the object system with those of specific measurements on the meter system, one can recover the original object interferences.

The case in which the meter is a system distinct and spatially separated from the object is of particular interest. Indeed, in this case the decision to erase or not the meter “mark” and thus the distinguishability of the object amplitudes (i.e., to observe or not interference) can be taken long after the object has been measured. Quantum erasure is then performed in the *delayed choice* mode which best captures the essence of the phenomenon [6, 7]. On the other hand, the neutral kaon system shows us that the erasure operation can be carried out actively, i.e., by exerting the free will of the experimenter, or passively, i.e., randomly exploiting a particular quantum-mechanical property of the meter system.

The specific purposes of this contribution are to discuss how one can distinguish between “*active*” and “*passive*” quantum erasure for neutral kaons and how one can operate in the “*delayed choice*” mode. Entangled pairs of kaons turn out to be maximally appropriate for these two purposes.

2 Strangeness and lifetime measurements

Contrary to what happens with spin-1/2 particles or photons, neutral kaons only exhibit two different measurement bases [8, 9]: the strangeness and the lifetime bases.

The strangeness basis, $\{K^0, \bar{K}^0\}$ with $\langle K^0 | \bar{K}^0 \rangle = 0$, is the appropriate one to discuss strong production and reactions of kaons. If a dense piece of

nucleonic matter is inserted along a neutral kaon beam, the incoming state is projected either into a K^0 by the strangeness conserving strong interaction $K^0 p \rightarrow K^+ n$ or into a $\bar{K}^0$ via $\bar{K}^0 p \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^+$, $\bar{K}^0 n \rightarrow K^- p$ or $\bar{K}^0 n \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^0$. These strangeness detections are totally analogous to the projective von Neumann measurements of a two-channel analyzer, e.g., of polarized photons. By inserting the piece of matter along the beam, one induces an “*active*” measurement of strangeness.

The strangeness content of neutral kaon states can alternatively be detected by observing their semileptonic decay modes. Indeed, these semileptonic decays obey the well tested $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule which allows the modes

$$K^0(\bar{s}d) \rightarrow \pi^-(\bar{u}d) + l^+ + \nu_l, \quad \bar{K}^0(s\bar{d}) \rightarrow \pi^+(u\bar{d}) + l^- + \bar{\nu}_l, \quad (1)$$

where l stands for e or μ , but forbids decays into the respective charge conjugated modes. Obviously, the experimenter cannot induce a kaon to decay semileptonically or even at a given time: he or she can only sort at the end of the day all observed events in proper decay modes and time intervals. We thus have a “*passive*” procedure for strangeness measurements.

The *active* measurement is then monitored by strangeness conservation while the *passive* measurement is assured by the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule. The probabilities for single kaons measured using both procedures have been proved to agree with the quantum-mechanical predictions [10, 11, 12].

The second basis, the lifetime basis $\{K_S, K_L\}$, consists of the short- and long-lived states having well defined masses $m_{S(L)}$ and decay widths $\Gamma_{S(L)}$. It is the appropriate basis to discuss their propagation in free space, where

$$|K_S(\tau)\rangle = e^{-i\lambda_S\tau}|K_S\rangle, \quad |K_L(\tau)\rangle = e^{-i\lambda_L\tau}|K_L\rangle, \quad (2)$$

with $\lambda_{S(L)} = m_{S(L)} - i\Gamma_{S(L)}/2$. These states preserve their own identity in time, but, since $\Gamma_S \simeq 579 \Gamma_L$, the K_S component extincts much faster than the K_L component. To observe if a kaon propagates as a K_S or K_L at (proper) time τ , one has to detect at which time it subsequently decays. Kaons which are observed to decay before $\simeq \tau + 4.8 \tau_S$ have to be identified as K_S ’s, while those surviving after this time interval have to be identified as K_L ’s. Misidentifications then reduce only to a few parts in 10^{-3} [8, 13, 14]. Such a procedure, which necessarily has to allow for free-space propagation, represents an “*active*” measurement of lifetime.

Since 40 years one knows that the neutral kaon system violates the CP symmetry. Among other things, this implies that the weak interaction eigenstates are not strictly orthogonal, $\langle K_S | K_L \rangle = 2(\text{Re } \varepsilon)/(1 + |\varepsilon|^2) \simeq 3.2 \cdot 10^{-3}$

[10, 15]. However, by neglecting these small CP violation effects we can discriminate between K_S 's and K_L 's by leaving the kaons to propagate in free space and observing their nonleptonic $K_S \rightarrow 2\pi$ or $K_L \rightarrow 3\pi$ decay modes. This represents a “*passive*” measurement of lifetime, since the type of kaon decay mode —nonleptonic in the present case, instead of semileptonic as before— cannot be in any way influenced by the experimenter.

The *active* and *passive* lifetime measurements are efficient thanks to the smallness of Γ_L/Γ_S and ε , respectively. Since $\Gamma_L/\Gamma_S \simeq |\varepsilon| \simeq \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$, both effects are very small and can be safely neglected in our discussion.

Summarizing, we have two different experimental procedures —*active* and *passive*— to measure each one of the only two neutral kaon observables: strangeness or lifetime. The existence of these two alternative measurement procedures has no analog in any other two-level quantum system. In this sense, kaons offer new possibilities for quantum erasure experiments, though other non-kaonic two-level systems clearly offer more (in principle, infinite many) measurement bases.

3 *Active and passive joint measurements*

We now introduce an entangled two-kaon state which is analogous to the standard and widely used entangled two-photon states produced via spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC). Through the decay of the $\Phi(1020)$ -meson resonance [16] or S -wave proton-antiproton annihilation [17] one obtains the anti-symmetric and maximally entangled state at time $\tau = 0$:

$$|\phi(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[|K^0\rangle_l |\bar{K}^0\rangle_r - |\bar{K}^0\rangle_l |K^0\rangle_r \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[|K_L\rangle_l |K_S\rangle_r - |K_S\rangle_l |K_L\rangle_r \right], \quad (3)$$

where l and r denote the “left” and “right” directions of motion of the two separating kaons. The state has been written in the two observable bases and CP -violating effects are neglected.

After production, the left (right) moving kaon evolves according to Eq. (2) up to time τ_l (τ_r) to produce the state:

$$|\phi(\tau_l, \tau_r)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ e^{-i(\lambda_L \tau_l + \lambda_S \tau_r)} |K_L\rangle_l |K_S\rangle_r - e^{-i(\lambda_S \tau_l + \lambda_L \tau_r)} |K_S\rangle_l |K_L\rangle_r \right\}. \quad (4)$$

By normalizing to kaon pairs with both members surviving up to (τ_l, τ_r) , one

obtains the state:

$$|\phi(\Delta\tau)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + e^{\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau}}} \left\{ |K_L\rangle_l |K_S\rangle_r - e^{i\Delta m\Delta\tau} e^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau} |K_S\rangle_l |K_L\rangle_r \right\} \quad (5)$$

($\Delta\tau = \tau_l - \tau_r$ and $\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma_L - \Gamma_S$) or, in the strangeness basis:

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(\Delta\tau)\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 + e^{\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau}}} \left\{ (1 - e^{i\Delta m\Delta\tau} e^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau}) \left[|K^0\rangle_l |K^0\rangle_r - |\bar{K}^0\rangle_l |\bar{K}^0\rangle_r \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 + e^{i\Delta m\Delta\tau} e^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau}) \left[|K^0\rangle_l |\bar{K}^0\rangle_r - |\bar{K}^0\rangle_l |K^0\rangle_r \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

With this normalization, we work with bipartite two-level systems as for spin-1/2 entangled pairs. The analogy between state (5) and the polarization-entangled two-photon state $|\Psi\rangle = [|V\rangle_i |H\rangle_s - e^{i\Delta\phi} |H\rangle_i |V\rangle_s] / \sqrt{2}$, where $\Delta\phi$ is a relative phase under control by the experimenter [3], is obvious. For an accurate description of the time evolution of entangled neutral kaon pairs, see Refs. [18, 19].

In the remainder of this section we discuss the derivation of the observable joint probabilities corresponding to *active* and *passive* measurements.

3.1 *Active* measurements on both kaons

Considering an *active* strangeness measurement on both sides means to act with the projectors $P_i^l P_j^r$ ($P_i = |K^0\rangle\langle K^0|, |\bar{K}^0\rangle\langle \bar{K}^0|$) onto state (6). The probabilities to observe on both sides like- or unlike-strangeness events are:

$$P[K^0(\tau_l), K^0(\tau_r)] = P[\bar{K}^0(\tau_l), \bar{K}^0(\tau_r)] = \frac{1}{4} \{1 - \mathcal{V}(\Delta\tau) \cos(\Delta m\Delta\tau)\}, \quad (7)$$

$$P[K^0(\tau_l), \bar{K}^0(\tau_r)] = P[\bar{K}^0(\tau_l), K^0(\tau_r)] = \frac{1}{4} \{1 + \mathcal{V}(\Delta\tau) \cos(\Delta m\Delta\tau)\}, \quad (8)$$

where:

$$\mathcal{V}(\Delta\tau) = \frac{1}{\cosh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau/2)} \quad (9)$$

is the visibility of the K^0 - $\bar{K}^0$ oscillations. First, we note that for $\Delta\tau = 0$ we have perfect EPR-correlations: the like-strangeness probabilities vanish and the unlike-strangeness probabilities take the maximum value [$\mathcal{V}(0) = 1$]. Second, $\Delta m\Delta\tau$ plays the same role as the relative orientation of polarization analyzers in the entangled photon case. The kaon mass difference Δm introduces automatically a time dependent relative phase between the two kaon

amplitudes. However, opposite to the photon case, the visibility decreases as $|\Delta\tau| \rightarrow \infty$.

If one wants to measure, *actively*, strangeness on the left and lifetime on the right, one has to remove the piece of matter on the right to allow for free kaon propagation in space. One can then measure the following non-oscillating joint probabilities:

$$P[K^0(\tau_l), K_S(\tau_r)] = P[\bar{K}^0(\tau_l), K_S(\tau_r)] = \frac{1}{2(1 + e^{\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau})}, \quad (10)$$

$$P[K^0(\tau_l), K_L(\tau_r)] = P[\bar{K}^0(\tau_l), K_L(\tau_r)] = \frac{1}{2(1 + e^{-\Delta\Gamma\Delta\tau})}. \quad (11)$$

3.2 *Passive* measurements on both kaons

In this case of *passive* measurements along both beams, one allows the entangled kaon pairs to propagate freely in space and identifies the kaon decay *times* and *modes*. As discussed in detail in Ref. [9], one has to measure the joint decay rate $\Gamma(f_l, \tau_l; f_r, \tau_r)$ which is defined as the number of left-side decays into the mode f_l between τ_l and $\tau_l + d\tau_l$ accompanied by right-side decays into the mode f_r between τ_r and $\tau_r + d\tau_r$ divided by $d\tau_l$, $d\tau_r$ and the total number of initial kaon pairs. The quantum-mechanical expressions for this joint decay rate can be easily deduced from Eq. (4). Additionally, one has to compute the four partial decay widths $\Gamma(K_{f_i} \rightarrow f_i)$, where $K_{f_i} \rightarrow f_i$ stands for the four identifying decay modes $K_S \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K_L \rightarrow \pi\pi\pi$, $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^- l^+ \nu_l$ or $\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ l^- \bar{\nu}_l$. Finally, one has to take into account the extinction of the beams via the normalization factor $N(\tau_l, \tau_r) \equiv e^{-(\Gamma_L + \Gamma_S)(\tau_l + \tau_r)/2} \cosh[(\Gamma_L - \Gamma_S)(\tau_l - \tau_r)/2]$ which depends on both τ_l and τ_r . This allows one to define all the relevant joint detection probabilities through the relation [9]:

$$P[K_{f_l}(\tau_l), K_{f_r}(\tau_r)] = \frac{\Gamma(f_l, \tau_l; f_r, \tau_r)}{N(\tau_l, \tau_r) \Gamma(K_{f_l} \rightarrow f_l) \Gamma(K_{f_r} \rightarrow f_r)}, \quad (12)$$

where $K_{f_l}, K_{f_r} = K^0, \bar{K}^0, K_L$ or K_S .

It is easy to see that the physical meaning and the quantum mechanical expression for the probabilities in Eq. (12) coincide with the previously considered probabilities in Eqs. (7)–(11). However, while the latter are measured either by actively inserting or removing a piece of nucleonic matter in the two beams, the measurement method via Eq. (12) is completely different: the

quantum-mechanical probabilities alone decide if each one of the two kaons of a given pair is going to be measured in the strangeness or lifetime basis. The experimenter remains passive in such measurements.

3.3 *Active and passive measurements*

One can similarly combine an *active* measurement on one side with a *passive* measurements on the other. With the information given in the two previous subsections, it is quite easy to reproduce, as expected, the quantum-mechanical results of Eqs. (7)–(11).

4 Quantum eraser experiments for kaons

Several quantum eraser experiments have already been performed [3, 4, 5]. They use SPDC to produce a two-photon maximally entangled state which is the analog of the kaon state of Eq. (5). One photon of the pair is considered as the *object* system. On this photon one wants to obtain (or not) “which way” information (*WW*) by a suitable measurement on the *meter* photon. Different strategies are used for marking and erasing this *WW* information. All these experiments need a kind of double-slit mechanism in order to allow for a “wave like” behaviour of the meter-object system, which then leads to a state similar to the one of Eq. (5) but with $\Gamma_S = \Gamma_L = 0$. Photon stability is certainly an advantage. However, in the neutral kaon system there is no need of such a double-slit mechanism: it is *automatically* offered by the special time evolution of kaons.

To understand this better, let us discuss the time evolution of a single neutral kaon, e.g. a $|K^0(\tau)\rangle$. Just after its production it is an equal superposition of the lifetime eigenstates, $|K^0(\tau = 0)\rangle = \{|K_S\rangle + |K_L\rangle\}/\sqrt{2}$, and according to Eq. (2) it starts propagating in free space in the coherent superposition:

$$|K^0(\tau)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{e^{-i\lambda_S\tau}|K_S\rangle + e^{-i\lambda_L\tau}|K_L\rangle\}. \quad (13)$$

The K^0 proceeds through a single spatial trajectory comprising *automatically* (i.e., with no need of any double-slit like apparatus) the two differently propagating components K_S and K_L . At $\tau = 0$ there is no information on which component is propagating but for kaons surviving after some time τ ,

K_S propagation is less likely than K_L propagation. For kaons, this allows one to obtain “which width” information (WW) in the very same way as one can obtain “which way” information (WW) for photons passing through a double-slit device.

Being the two-kaon states of Eq. (5) or (6) automatically given by Nature, one can play the game of quantum marking and eraser experiments. Four possible experiments are discussed in the following [20]. In the first three, (a),(b) and (c), the left moving kaon is the object; on this kaon one performs *active* strangeness measurements —placing a piece of matter— at different τ_l -values to scan for possible K^0 – $\bar{K}^0$ oscillations. The right moving kaon is the meter; it carries WW information which can be actively or passively erased by a suitable *active* or *passive* measurement at a fixed time τ_r^0 . In the fourth experiment (d), *passive* measurements are performed on both sides. It is not clear which kaon, the left or the right moving one, is playing the role of the meter: this exemplifies the central point of the delayed choice erasure.

(a) Active eraser with *active* measurements

In a first set-up we insert *active* strangeness detectors along both beams and consider only kaon pairs which survive up to both detectors. We clearly observe K_S – K_L interference in the coincident counts of the object–meter system with the visibility $\mathcal{V}(\tau_l - \tau_r^0)$ of Eq. (9). More precisely, we observe fringes for unlike-strangeness joint detections, Eq. (8), and anti-fringes for like-strangeness joint detections, Eq. (7). In a second set-up one removes the piece of matter along the right beam. One observes the lifetime of the meter and thus obtains WW information for the object kaon as well. The coincidence counts of the object and meter kaons show now no interference effects. They follow the non-oscillatory behaviour of Eqs. (10) and (11).

Hence, we have constructed a quantum eraser allowing the experimenter to erase or not the WW information by placing or not the piece of matter along the right beam. The first set-up shows the “wave-like” behaviour of the object kaon, i.e., the two different components K_S and K_L are indistinguishable because their marks are made inoperative by the strangeness measurement on the meter kaon. One gets interferences as in common double-slit experiments with indistinguishable paths. The second set-up clearly demonstrates the “particle-like” behaviour of the object kaon: no interference is observed because the meter mark is operative and one gains WW information on the right moving kaon. It mimics double-slit set-ups with complete

path information.

These experiments are analogous to the photon experiments of Refs. [3, 4], as discussed in detail in Ref. [14]. Note, however, that in the kaon case the amplitudes are automatically marked and no double-slit is needed.

(b) Partially active eraser with *active* measurements

In this case one always inserts a piece of matter in the right hand beam at a fixed time τ_r^0 , but the experiment is now also designed to detect decays (any decay modes) occurring between the origin and this piece of matter. In this way the right moving kaon —the meter— can make the “choice” to show WW information by decaying before τ_r^0 . If the meter kaon does indeed decay in free space, one measures its lifetime *actively* and obtains WW information. If no decay is seen, the incoming kaon is projected into one of the two strangeness states at τ_r^0 by an *active* strangeness measurement.

With a single experimental set-up one observes the “wave” behaviour (interference) for some events and the “particle” behaviour (WW information) for others. The choice to obtain or not WW information is naturally given by the instability of the kaons. However, the experimenter can still choose when —the time τ_r^0 — he or she wants to learn something about the strangeness of the meter system. Thus there is no control over the marking and the erasure of individual kaon pairs, but a probabilistic prediction for an ensemble of kaon pairs is known. We call this a partially active eraser experiment.

This experiment is analogous to the eraser experiment with entangled photons of Ref. [5]. The role played by the beam-splitter transmittivities in the photonic experiment is played by τ_r^0 in the kaon case.

(c) Passive eraser with a *passive* measurement

In this experiment one is interested in the different decay modes of the right moving meter kaon and one thus considers a *passive* measurement of strangeness or lifetime on it. Now one clearly has a completely passive erasing operation on the meter and the experimenter has no control on the operativity of the lifetime mark. Only the object system is under some kind of active control —one still makes an *active* strangeness measurement and considers only kaons surviving up to this detector. Remarkably, one finds the same joint probabilities as in the previous cases (a) and (b).

(d) Passive eraser with *passive* measurements

This is the extreme case of a (passive) quantum eraser. The experimenter has no control over any individual pair *neither* on which of the two complementary observables are going to be measured *nor* when they are measured. The experiment is also totally symmetric and so it shows the full behaviour of the maximally entangled state (5). Remarkably, the results of the observable probabilities are again in agreement with all previous results. However, as nothing is actively measured or erased, it is hard to speak about a quantum eraser. Clearly, there exists no analog for any other spin-1/2 entangled system (except for the $B^0\bar{B}^0$ system²).

In particular, the joint probabilities for like- and unlike-strangeness measurements coincide with those in Eqs. (7) and (8). They are measured by counting and properly sorting the joint semileptonic decays occurring at different values of τ_l and at fixed τ_r^0 . The oscillatory behaviour on each one of these variables is observed regardless τ_l is larger or smaller than τ_r^0 . The same happens with the joint probabilities in Eqs. (10) and (11) corresponding to strangeness-lifetime passive measurements. Their non-oscillatory behaviour is observed regardless of the time ordering of τ_l and τ_r^0 . For kaons, the delayed choice mode of a quantum eraser contains no additional mystery. Time ordering is seen not to be the issue. It is the sorting of the various joint events, irrespectively of any time consideration, which is crucial for quantum erasure.

5 Conclusions

Under the assumption of CP conservation and the validity of the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule, we have shown that kaons admit two alternative procedures to measure their two complementary observables: strangeness and lifetime. We call these procedures *active* and *passive* measurements. The first one can be seen as an analog to the usual von Neumann projection, the second one is quite different and takes advantage of the information spontaneously released by the neutral kaon decay modes.

We proposed four different experiments combining *active* and *passive* measurement procedures and demonstrating the quantum erasure principle

²Due to the very short B -meson lifetime, for the $B^0\bar{B}^0$ system only *passive* measurements are possible and clearly only a passive eraser can be realized.

for kaons. Remarkably, all four considered experiments lead to the same observable probabilities and to the same physical results and —more important for delayed choice considerations— this is true regardless of the temporal ordering of the measurements. In our view, this illustrates the very nature of a quantum eraser experiment: it essentially sorts different events, namely, strangeness–strangeness events representing the “wave” property of the object or strangeness–lifetime events representing the “particle” property of the object.

There are no experiments up to date verifying the proposed quantum marking and eraser ideas, except that the CPLEAR collaboration [17] did part of the job of our first set-up (a) showing the entanglement of kaon pairs and measuring two points testing the oscillatory behaviour of strangeness–strangeness joint detections. We think that the proposed experiments are of interest because they offer a new test of complementarity and shed new light on the very concept of the quantum eraser.

Acknowledgements

This work has been partly supported by EURIDICE HPRN-CT-2002-00311, BFM-2002-02588, Austrian Science Foundation (FWF)-SFB 015 P06 and INFN.

References

- [1] M. O. Scully and K. Drühl, *Phys. Rev. A* **25**, 2208 (1982).
- [2] M. O. Scully, B.-G. Englert and H. Walther, *Nature* **351**, 111 (1991).
- [3] T. J. Herzog, P. G. Kwiat, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3034 (1995).
- [4] S.P. Walborn et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 033818 (2002).
- [5] Y.-H. Kim, R. Yu, S. P. Kulik, Y. Shih and M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1 (2000).
- [6] M. O. Scully, B.-G. Englert and H. Walther, *Am. J. Phys.* **67**, 325 (1999).
- [7] U. Mohrhoff, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 1468 (1996); *Am. J. Phys.* **67**, 330 (1999).

- [8] A. Bramon and G. Garbarino, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 040403 (2002); **89**, 160401 (2002); A. Bramon and M. Nowakowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1 (1999).
- [9] B. Ancochea, A. Bramon and M. Nowakowski, *Phys. Rev.* **D 60**, 094008 (1999).
- [10] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D 66**, 010001 (2002).
- [11] A. Angelopoulos et al., *Phys. Rept.* **374**, 165 (2003).
- [12] A. Bramon, G. Garbarino and B. C. Hiesmayr, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C 32**, 377 (2004).
- [13] P. H. Eberhard, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 398**, 155 (1993).
- [14] A. Bramon, G. Garbarino and B. C. Hiesmayr, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** 020405 (2004).
- [15] P. K. Kabir, “*The CP Puzzle*” (Academic Press, London, 1968).
- [16] For a survey on the physics at a Φ -factory see “*The Second DaΦne Physics Handbook*”, edited by L. Maiani, G. Pancheri and N. Paver (INFN, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, 1995).
- [17] A. Apostolakis et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B 422**, 339 (1998).
- [18] G.C. Ghirardi, R. Grassi and T. Weber, Proceedings of the *Workshop on Physics and Detectors for DaΦne*, edited by G. Pancheri (INFN, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, 1991) p.261.
- [19] R. A. Bertlmann and B. C. Hiesmayr, *Phys. Rev.* **A 63**, 062112 (2001); B. C. Hiesmayr, PhD thesis, University of Vienna, 2002.
- [20] A. Bramon, G. Garbarino and B. C. Hiesmayr, *Phys. Rev.* **A** (in press).